

E-FILED on 11/5/07

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

MEMRY CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

KENTUCKY OIL TECHNOLOGY, N.V.,
PETER BESSELINK, MEMORY METALS
HOLLAND, B.V.,

Defendants.

No. C-04-03843 RMW

ORDER DENYING KENTUCKY OIL'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

[Re Docket No. 640]

KENTUCKY OIL TECHNOLOGY, N.V.,

Counterclaimant,

v.

MEMRY CORPORATION and
SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY
CORPORATION,


Counterdefendants.

By its order dated April 8, 2005, the court dismissed KOT's sixth counterclaim for declaration of invalidity and unenforceability of STC's issued patents that are allegedly based upon Peter Besselink's Biflex technology. *See* Order Granting in Part and Denying In Part

1 Counterdefendants' Motion to Dismiss dated April 8, 2005, Docket No. 65. KOT seeks leave of this
 2 court to file a motion for reconsideration of the court's decision based upon the Supreme Court's
 3 opinion in *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 764 (2007).

4 In *MedImmune*, the Supreme Court clarified that the "actual controversy" requirement of the
 5 Declaratory Judgment Act demands only "that the dispute be definite and concrete, touching the
 6 legal relations of parties having adverse legal interests; that it be real and substantial and admit of
 7 specific relief through a decree of a conclusive character, as distinguished from an opinion advising
 8 what the law would be upon a hypothetical state of facts." *MedImmune*, 127 S. Ct. at 771-72. The
 9 Supreme Court noted that the Federal Circuit's "reasonable apprehension of imminent suit" test
 10 conflicted with several cases in which the Supreme Court had found that a declaratory judgment
 11 plaintiff had a justiciable controversy. *Id.* at 774 n. 11. Although this court mentioned the
 12 "reasonable apprehension of suit," reliance on that test is neither necessary or required. This court
 13 determined that KOT had shown by its assertion of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 256 only that it may
 14 have a concrete interest in the *outcome* of a determination of the validity or unenforceability rather
 15 than a definite and concrete dispute. "[E]ven if KOT prevails on its section 256 claim, there is no
 16 way of knowing that it will continue to challenge the patents' validity and enforceability. . . . Thus,
 17 the mere fact that it would be convenient for KOT to know whether Besselink could potentially
 18 become co-inventor of invalid and unenforceable patents does not create an 'actual controversy'
 19 where otherwise there would be none." April 8, 2005 Order at 23-24. Even under *Medimmune*, the
 20 court concludes that KOT's previously-dismissed counterclaim for a declaration of invalidity and
 21 unenforceability does not present an "actual controversy" for this court and denies KOT's motion for
 22 leave to file a motion for reconsideration.

23
 24 DATED: 11/5/07


 RONALD M. WHYTE
 United States District Judge

1 **Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:**

2 **Counsel for Memry:**

3 Andrew C. Ryan ryan@cantorcolburn.com
 4 William J. Cass wcass@cantorcolburn.com
 5 Thomas Mango tmango@cantorcolburn.com
 6 Benjamin J. Holl benjamin.holl@dbr.com
 7 Charles A. Reid, III charles.reid@dbr.com

8 **Counsel for STC:**

9 Nancy J. Geenen ngeenen@foleylaw.com
 10 David B. Moyer dmoyer@foley.com
 11 Kimberly K. Dodd kdodd@foley.com

12 **Counsel for KOT:**

13 Michael H. Bierman mbierman@luce.com
 14 Nicola A. Pisano npisano@luce.com
 15 Jeffrey David Wexler jwexler@luce.com

16 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not
 17 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

Dated: 11/5/07

/s/ MAG
 Chambers of Judge Whyte

United States District Court
 For the Northern District of California